

REMARKS

Claims 1-21 are pending in the application.

Claims 10-16 are allowed.

Claims 1-7, 17, 20 and 21 have been rejected.

Claims 1 and 6 have been objected to for informalities.

Claims 8, 9, 18, and 19 have been objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 1-5, 8, 18, 20 and 21 have been cancelled without prejudice.

Claim 6, 7, 9, 10, 12, 17, and 19 have been amended, as indicated above.

The specification has been amended, as indicated above, to correct minor informalities.

No new matter has been added.

Claims 1 and 6 were objected to due to informalities. Claim 1 has been cancelled without prejudice. Claim 6 has been amended accordingly.

Claims 1, 2, 6, 17 and 20-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 6,614,206 ("Wong") in view of US 5,781,390 ("Notaro").

Claims 3-5, and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wong in view of Notaro, and further in view of US 5,357,393 ("Mojaradi").

Applicant has cancelled Claims 1-5, 8, 18, 20 and 21 without prejudice or disclaimer of subject matter, rendering all pending rejections against them moot. Applicant respectfully reserves the right to re-present the subject matter of now cancelled Claims 1-5, 8, 18, 20 and 21 in a subsequently-filed continuation patent application.

Applicant notes with appreciation the allowance of Claims 9-15.

Claims 8, 9, 18, and 19 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the

limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The Applicant greatly appreciates the indication of allowability. Claims 6 and 17 have been amended accordingly. Claims 7, 9 and 19 have been amended to correct minor informalities and/or dependencies.

Comments to the Reason for Allowance

The Office Action sets for the reason for allowance for Claims 10-16 as being the presence of “a floating well [transistor] to provide both overvoltage protection and backflow current protection.” (OA at p. 9). For the allowability of Claims 8, 9, 18, and 19, the reason for indication of allowable subject matter was the use of a “floating well transistor [to protect] the circuit from both overvoltage and backflow current.” (OA at p. 8).

Applicant respectfully submits, however, that a further reason for allowance is because the hypothetical combination of the references of US 6,614,206 (“Wong”) in view of US 5,781,390 (“Notaro”), or the hypothetical combination of the references of Wong in view of Notaro and further in view of US 5,357,393 (“Mojaradi”) cited in the Office Action would not provide a *prima facie* basis for rejection of Applicant’s Claims 10-16, and objected to Claims 8, 9, 18 and 19.

Conclusion

As a result of the foregoing, the Applicant respectfully submits that in addition to Claims 10-16, that Claims 6, 7, 9, 17, and 19 are in condition for allowance, and respectfully requests an early allowance of such Claims.

If any issues arise, or if the Examiner has any suggestions for expediting allowance of this Application, the Applicant respectfully invites the Examiner to contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below or at ksmith@texaspatents.com.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees connected with this communication or credit any overpayment to Garlick Harrison & Markison Deposit Account No. 50-2126.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 26, 2005

/Kevin L. Smith/
Kevin L. Smith, Reg. No. 38,620
Attorney for Applicant

Garlick Harrison & Markison, LLP
P.O. Box 160727
Austin, TX 78716-0727
(972) 772-8836/office
(972) 772-5033/facsimile